

R4NGER5 RADIO EPISODE 68



Photo: courtesy Peekok

HACK THE PLANET!

RECORDING TIME: TBA



Thanks again Peekok

News

Hilaire Purbrick, 45, has inhabited the seven-foot cave he dug on his plot and dined off the land for the past 16 years. Thanks Kevin!

But after having the dwelling checked by the fire brigade, Brighton and Hove City Council decided it did not have enough exits and sought an injunction banning him from entering it. Mr Purbrick ignored the order and continued to live in the cave, but was pulled back into court on Tuesday when a judge granted the council a possession order which will allow him to be formally evicted and banned indefinitely from the site.

Mr Purbrick now plans to take his fight to the European Court of Human Rights, claiming his right to a private life and freedom has been breached by the order. "I am still living there and intend to continue to do so," he said. "I know lots of people in this town who live in houses with only one door with no fire exit."

The keen gardener has a history of overcoming legal challenges to his earthy home. In 1999, town hall authorities threatened to remove him, claiming he was running an illegal vegetable shop. But Mr Purbrick won a reprieve after claiming his site "was hardly a Sainsbury's" and he only had one customer – a pregnant woman who bought his sprouts.

The following year he successfully fought an eviction order after complaints he was keeping chickens and bees without permission. Granting the possession order at Brighton County Court, Judge Jonathan Simpkins said there were legitimate health and safety concerns that the cave could collapse. "The council considers this was a danger to life. They have a responsibility to the public," he said.

Mr Purbrick's decision to appeal to the European courts was made after the judge refused leave to appeal in a UK court, saying it was a "hopeless cause of trying to resist the inevitable".

Link: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstoppers/howaboutthat/5559326/Eco-warrior-evicted-from-cave-dwelling-without-fire-exit.html>

Music fans were able to download albums by top artists for just 29p on Wednesday after a mistake by Amazon. Thanks Ghost Dog!

The online retail giant unwittingly cut the prices of releases such as Kings Of Leon's *Because Of The Times* and Lily Allen's *It's Not Me, It's You*.

The mistake, which was publicised by several consumer websites, was rectified after about four hours. Other albums available for 29p included MGMT's *Oracular Spectacular* and Yeah Yeah Yeahs' *It's Blitz!* Albums by Bruce Springsteen, Calvin Harris and James Morrison were also among the 30 or so being sold at the cut price.

In a statement, Amazon said: "We can confirm that yesterday there was a pricing error on a small number of MP3 albums. This issue has been rectified. Despite our best efforts, with the millions of items available on our website, pricing errors can occur."

There have been suggestions the mistake could alter the charts this Sunday, but Newsbeat understands there weren't enough hits to make a difference.

Dan from Selby was one listener who took advantage of the mistake.

"I was just looking at CDs," he says, "I just sort of found the song that I wanted and the song was 69p and the album was 29p, so I just clicked it and downloaded it.

"I bought Black Eyed Peas, Calvin Harris - altogether I got about 10 - spent about £2.99 on 10 CDs when it should have cost me 60 or 70 quid, so it was quite good."

Link: http://news.bbc.co.uk/newsbeat/hi/music/newsid_8107000/8107301.stm#

CO11 review database draws questions from the NUJ Thanks Peekok!

The Met are in the process of weeding data and images of protesters from the CRIMINT database that they are unable to justify retaining, according to the Home Office. In a response to parliamentary questions they state that CO11, the Public Order Branch are conducting a 'manual review' of photographs they have taken on demonstrations and political assemblies. This follows the Court of Appeal case of Andrew Wood, when it was found that the Met were not justified in retaining pictures of the Campaign Against the Arms Trade activist.

The criteria the police are using to 'review' entries on the database is unclear. Senior officers within CO11 have previously stated that intelligence can be held on people who have no criminal record, and who have done nothing unlawful. An awful lot seems to depend on the subjective judgement of FIT officers, and the estimated 'threat' from groups such as environmentalists and anti-militarists, or pro-Tamil or Palestinian demonstrators.

In an effort to find out just what data the police hold on them FITwatchers and others have applied under the Data Protection Act to see the information on file. The police have been slow to respond, and so far very little has come to light. The NUJ announced last week that they are making a formal complaint to the data commissioner about the failure of the public order unit to provide details of the data they hold on journalists.

It'll be interesting to see how much information is eventually revealed – the police will undoubtedly try and hide behind the 'national security' and 'prevention of crime' exemptions to the Act. Additionally many protesters might justifiably be wary of making data requests, as it inevitably means providing a name and address and details of demonstrations attended. But potentially this is a useful way of getting a better picture of the scale of the information held, and any readers of this blog who would like more info or support for doing this should e-mail us at defycops@yahoo.co.uk

Link: <http://fitwatch.blogspot.com/2009/06/co11-review-database.html>

Wind power may be the key to a clean energy revolution: a new study in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* finds that wind power could provide for the entire world's current and future energy needs. Thanks Kevin!

To estimate the earth's capacity for wind power, the researchers first sectioned the globe into areas of approximately 3,300 square kilometers (1,274 square miles) and surveyed local wind speeds every six hours. They imagined 2.5 megawatt turbines crisscrossing the terrestrial globe, excluding "areas classified as forested, areas occupied by permanent snow or ice, areas covered by water, and areas identified as either developed or urban," according to the paper. They also included the possibility of 3.6 megawatt offshore wind turbines, but restricted them to 50 nautical miles off the coast and to oceans depths less than 200 meters.

Using this criteria the researchers found that wind energy could not only supply all of the world's energy requirements, but it could provide over forty times the world's current electrical consumption and over five times the global use of total energy needs.

Turning to the world's two largest carbon emitters, China and the United States, the researchers found that wind power has the potential to easily supply both

"Large-scale development of wind power in China could allow for close to an 18-fold increase in electricity supply relative to consumption reported for 2005," the researchers write. "The bulk of this wind power, 89%, could be derived from onshore installations. The potential for wind power in the U.S. is even greater, 23 times larger than current electricity consumption, the bulk of which, 84%, could be supplied onshore."

Expanding their view to the top ten carbon emitters, the researchers found that Russia, Canada, and the United States (in this order) had the greatest capacity for wind power. However, they note that much of the area available for wind power in Russia and Canada is far from any cities, making their construction costly. In addition, the authors note that the public may oppose wind turbines in particular areas, especially remote, ecologically sensitive regions. Still, they conclude that "despite these limitations, it is clear that wind power could make a significant contribution to the demand for electricity" in most high carbon emitting countries.

Link: http://news.mongabay.com/2009/0622-hance_global_wind.html

From Michael Tiemann's blog – Microsoft naughtiness kills open source renaissance dreams.

Thanks Schneelocke!

My recent visit to Brazil was a wonderful validation of the belief that I've held for more than 20 years: if you give people a better way to do things, they'll do better things. The Brazilian government continues to expand its adoption of open source, both across more and more ministries and deeper within each ministry. I had the pleasure of talking with one of Brazil's top IT strategists, and she told me some very interesting things, both encouraging and alarming.

The encouraging thing she told me was that open source adoption continues to accelerate in all dimensions of the government. Whereas in the past government agencies were very conservative about choosing and changing software product decisions, open source has created a new paradigm. Proprietary software quality is so unknowable, and interoperability so suspect, that even simple decisions require extensive analysis and contingency planning. And indeed what possible process of evaluation could lead anybody to willingly increase their usage of proprietary products that are known to be [defective by design](#), [delayed in shipment](#), and [dead on arrival](#)? Open source software has upended conventional wisdom and process by simply working at the outset and then not failing in production. And Brazil is beginning to realize this means they can put better technology to work sooner, at lower cost, with less risk.

Amazing.

Now the biggest question is not whether or how to use open source software, but how to ensure that well-intentioned national policies don't destroy what seems to be working so well. I shared an insight that I learned while visiting the Malaysian [Open Source Competency Center](#) in Kuala Lumpur last year. What I learned is that the government is focused on rewarding the *use* of open source software, not merely its *creation*. How does this work from a sustainability point of view? After all, if there are not greater incentives for risky development, what will ensure that users will have what they need?

One of the greatest problems facing any technology that delivers value through interoperability with other system is the scourge of fragmentation. When governments do too much to incent development, they often create an over-supply of conflicting ways to solve a problem. One of the greatest examples of this in recent times was when President George Bush [pushed to approve between \\$100M and \\$200M to create an electronic health record](#) (EHR). It turns out that [the US government already](#)

[created one in the 1970s that worked perfectly well](#), and is working so well that [the entire nation of Finland is happily using it](#). Predictably, all the money recently allocated to lots of different EHR efforts created competing and conflicting standards that do not interoperate. Thus the blind incentive to *create* new technology has no real social reward.

On the other hand, when there are incentives to *use* technologies, and when those technologies are (1) free to access, and (2) provide the freedom to modify and adapt them to a specific purpose, [a whole new form of innovation](#), coupled with beneficial use, arises. And indeed, when the incentives for use are high enough, then would-be users will become developers of their own right, so that they can become users. And once there is a solution, there's no need to reinvent the wheel, because there's no artificial incentive to do so.

Thus, the policy lesson is that when you want to use technology in a new way, incent the users, not the developers.

On the alarm front, I heard specific confirmation of a storyline I've been following, which is that the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is basically telling governments: if you want contributions/investments from us, then you'll give Microsoft cabinet-level access to inform policy, and you'll use Microsoft products. For example, donations to educational initiatives require installing and teaching Microsoft products. It is similar to [another story line reported by Roy Shestowitz](#). My informant told me that she was fortunately able to point out to the President that this was against Brazil's sovereignty and interest, and is one of the reasons that President Lula came to FISL, to show is support for the freedoms that "software livre" (aka free software, aka open source) mean to Brazil.

Would that all Presidents and all ministers of all countries were so concerned about the sovereignty of their nation and the fiduciary care of their people!

Link: <http://opensource.org/node/445>

Some news from Germany - our beloved Zensursula (Ursula von der Leyen; "Zensur" = censorship) has confirmed that the new anti-child pornography laws were indeed just the first step towards a more comprehensive Internet censorship Thanks Schneelocke!

she's already let it be known a while ago that that no further restrictions were "currently" planned, and now she's confirmed this in a new interview, specifically talking about mobbing, insults (unlike in countries like the USA where there is at least a theoretical right to free speech, insulting someone is a crime in German, carrying - in its basic form - a penalty of up to one year in prison) and fraud

Of course, the justification she cites is the "dignity of man" guaranteed in the first article of the German constitution. Here's some very interesting commentary (in German) on the whole thing that specifically discusses why this attempt at justification is fallacious at best (although I personally don't think Hanlon's razor applies here):

<http://www.lawblog.de/index.php/archives/2009/08/02/die-meinungsfreiheit-als-sondermull/>

(English translation, courtesy of Google, is here:

<http://translate.google.com/translate?u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.lawblog.de%2Findex.php%2Farchives%2F2009%2F08%2F02%2Fdie-meinungsfreiheit-als-sondermull%2F&sl=de&tl=en&hl=en&ie=UTF-8>

; however, naturally, it'll be useless for anything other than getting an idea of the general gist of the text if you don't speak German.)

Someone on Slashdot[1] also made a joking reference to the Soup Nazi[2] from Seinfeld by bringing up the Internet Nazi: "No Internet for you!". Brilliant, but I wish it weren't so fitting.

1. <http://yro.slashdot.org/comments.pl?sid=1323255&cid=28923479>
2. https://secure.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/wiki/Soup_Nazi

Things you only think you own – Thanks Schneelocke!

Hundreds of Amazon Kindle owners awoke to discover that books by a certain famous author had mysteriously disappeared from their e-book readers. These were books that they had bought and paid for—[thought they owned](#).

But no, apparently the publisher changed its mind about offering an electronic edition, and apparently Amazon, whose business lives and dies by publisher happiness, caved. It electronically deleted all books by this author from people's Kindles and credited their accounts for the price.

This is ugly for all kinds of reasons. Amazon says that this sort of thing is “rare,” but that it can happen at all is unsettling; we’ve been taught to believe that e-books are, you know, just like books, only better. Already, we’ve learned that they’re not really like books, in that once we’re finished reading them, we can’t resell or even donate them. But now we learn that all sales may not even be final.

As one of my readers noted, it’s like Barnes & Noble sneaking into our homes in the middle of the night, taking some books that we’ve been reading off our nightstands, and leaving us a check on the coffee table.

You want to know the best part? The juicy, plump, dripping irony?

The author who was the victim of this Big Brotherish plot was none other than George Orwell. And the books were “1984” and “Animal Farm.”

Scary.

Link: <http://pogue.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/07/17/some-e-books-are-more-equal-than-others/>

BOBBIES ON THE BLEAT

A SchNEWS RETORT TO THE POLICE REPORT

SchNEWS has cast our cynical eye over the HMIC (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary) report about the policing of the G20 protests, 'Adapting To Protest'. The HMIC say they welcome feedback on the report. Well here's SchNEWS' take...

So why was this report commissioned? Maybe something about the police being out of order, the fact an innocent bystander was killed or that all this was caught on camera? In the words of the HMIC: *"The high volume of publicly sourced footage of the protests, including the events leading up to the death of Ian Tomlinson, has demonstrated the influence of 'citizen journalists' – members of the public who play an active role in collecting, analysing and distributing media themselves. Consequently, individual and collective police actions are under enormous public scrutiny."*

The report is more concerned about the perception of the police than the police actions themselves. Police were initially pleased with media coverage, but *"by the 5th April this was becoming more critical. This intensified following the emergence of images relating to the death of Ian Tomlinson."* One suggested solution to this is to have "embedded" journalists with police on the front line! Police say they face *"dilemmas around using potentially sensitive information connected with death or serious injuries at public order events which may subsequently become evidence in legal proceedings."* But this didn't stop them spinning a whole host of lies over the death of Ian Tomlinson (claiming there was no police contact, medics were assaulted, and he died from a heart attack - [SchNEWS 672](#)).

We are told that in relation to the press there should be *"Awareness and recognition of the UK press card by officers on cordons, to identify legitimate members of the press."* But what use is a press card when police officers don't give a damn if you are press or not? On April 2nd there was a Section 14 notice (under the Public Order Act) issued to the press. A City of London Police Inspector told the press to *"Go away for half an hour and possibly come back to help us resolve this situation."* He was acting on behalf of Commander Broadhurst who was top cop for the day – so harassment of the press was coming right from the top and being carried out by an Inspector. Yet the report makes no mention of this – it is not a case of a few officers failing to recognise press cards, it is a systematic abuse of the police's powers to manage the news and restrict the freedom of the press (it's also a shame more press don't stand up for press freedom and refuse to cooperate with unreasonable police demands).

In the build up to the G20 protests, there were lots of media reports anticipating violence. The report has a breathtaking omission: *"An article titled 'The Summer of Rage Starts Here' was published on a popular protester website by a member calling themselves London Anarchists."* But it totally fails to mention that the phrase "Summer of Rage" was coined by David Hartshorn, who heads the Met's public order branch. Also, no mention is made of police blogs gleefully spoiling for a fight, or Commander Simon O'Brien's boast: *"We're up to it and we're up for it."* Such spin can only be designed to try and deflect blame from the police themselves for ratcheting up the tension.

The report also conducted an opinion poll survey on the public's attitude to the police and protesting (well, they need to frame their PR correctly). It did admit that there was a split on whether the police handled the G20 protests well, but did show the public were largely

favourable of the police overall. Also it showed a distinct age and class bias, with young people and the working classes being the least in favour of the police – reflecting the obvious fact that the police are there for the rich rather than the poor and likely to hassle youth.

Curiously, the report is illustrated throughout with rent-a-mob riot porn photos: masked protesters, a fire, smashed windows, brew crew with a bottle... but funnily no snarling riot cops without ID numbers hitting people with truncheons!

There were some acknowledgements that the police did cock up on the day – apparently we will see all Met officers displaying their numbers in future (we wait with baited breath). The report is critical of police planning for the day saying that a whole protest should not be criminalised – it acknowledges that people have a right to protest and that this should be protected under human rights law: *“the police, are required to show a certain degree of tolerance towards peaceful gatherings... even if these protests cause a level of obstruction or disruption.”* How much disruption is a matter of “debate” according to the report.

The police claimed they were at a disadvantage when it comes to communication on the ground: they have to cope with a *“flexible and responsive protest community which is capable of advanced communication and immediate reaction to events on the ground. This is in stark contrast to the traditional communication capabilities of the police.”* So let’s get this straight – the police have at their disposal CCTV street coverage, helicopters tracking movements of crowds, radio communication equipment and a central command bunker overseeing the whole operation and they are at a disadvantage over us with mobile phones and a make-it-up-as-you-go-along attitude on the ground?!

The most controversial tactic of all, ‘kettling’ gets the thumbs up from the HMIC, which they qualify as being suitable as long as it is proportionate – but police should let people leave the areas if they er, like the look of you (ditch the black hoodie for a suit?). The report recommends updating ACPO’s public order manual and says that the police need to adapt their public order tactics. However, the police have already tried to deflect criticism of their tactics, with Commander Bob Broadhurst, the head of the Public Order Unit, laying the blame at the feet of inexperienced ordinary police officers for the violent and repressive policing at the G20. They ignore the whole issue of kettling and the fact that the two most reported instances of police abuse (the death of Ian Tomlinson and the blatant assault on Nicola Fisher) were committed by the TSG - the Met’s fully trained riot goons. The police are still trying to spin the few bad apples line, when we know it’s the whole damn cart that is rotten.

Link: <http://www.schnews.org.uk/archive/news6831.php>

Feedback:

From Raindog:

Hi. I've promised a video on fixing broken sockets in audio players. Well, made an instructable instead:

<http://www.instructables.com/id/Fixing-the-Socket-in-an-Audio-Player/>

BTW, is this still the address to mail to, or is there something better than your private mailbox?

R4nger5 news :

- Incoming media – the editing draws ever closer for the r4nger5 meet footage, my sailing movie and **Back of Beyond**, the new video series I'm working on
- Been busy wild camping – got a little depressed about the CCTV thing and people in general – needed to get my head back in the game.
- **Machinae Supremacy** gave us permission to use their stuff!

Half time Music

- **Track 1** – Machinae Supremacy – **Fury** - <http://www.machinaesupremacy.com/webography.php>
- **Track 2** – Mancek – **Virus Trance**
- **Track 3** – Lucy Knisley – **It's Our Day** <http://www.lucyknisley.com/>

Discussion : V and Weaver talk about new tech and where it might go.

Links:

Usual suspects

- www.rantmadia.ca with newly redesigned site
- www.stormthewire.com Newish vids
- www.kevinisageek.org
- www.standovermedia.tk
- www.wogrant.com
- www.wognetwork.com
- www.rostudios.org – they rule!

and

www.r4nger5.com

www.r4nger5blog.tk

IRC Server

irc.freenode.net room: **#r4nger5**

<http://sittingnow.co.uk/> nice counterculture site – **thanx Raindog!**

Reccomedia:

Practical Ways to Defend Your Freedom Of Speech

<http://www.fr33agents.com/474/practical-ways-to-defend-your-freedom-of-speech/> **Thanks Avagdu!**

Big Labor + Big Government = Big Problems

<http://www.fr33agents.com/455/big-labor-big-government-big-problems/> **Thanks Avagdu!**

You're Just too Dumb

<http://www.fr33agents.com/437/youre-just-too-dumb/> **Thanks Avagdu!**

Go Green Should be Voluntary

<http://www.fr33agents.com/343/go-green-should-be-voluntary/> **Thanks Avagdu!**

+ some new footage and pictures on r4nger5tube and V's flickr page.

Outro Music

- **Track 1** – Machinae Supremacy – **Sidology 2: Trinity** - <http://www.machinaesupremacy.com/webography.php>
- **Track 2** – Mancek – **Soundscape1**
- **Track 3** – Lucy Knisley – **Be Mine** - <http://www.lucyknisley.com/>
- **Rant** – 2 The Ranting Gryphon - **Justice**

